

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. In response to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2001, no claims have been amended, added or cancelled. However, all issues raised in the Office Action are addressed herein. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this Application. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of the application.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103(A)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 and 27 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Jenson*, U.S. Patent No. 5,457,476 in view of *Conmy et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,101,480 (hereinafter "*Conmy*").

Claim 26 is rejected as being unpatentable over *Jenson* and *Conmy*, and further in view of *Mann et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,621,458 (hereinafter "*Mann*").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for reasons set forth herein.

SUMMARY OF THE CITED ART

Jenson teaches a method of moving temporal-based entries such as appointments within and/or between temporal based functions such as a scheduler, to-do list and a note function. However, *Jenson*'s personal organizer does not have the capability of displaying multiple calendars. *Jenson*, in fact, handles a **single** calendar on a personal organizer.

Conmy discloses an electronic calendar using a "**client/server architecture**" (column 3, lines 21-25). In a network that uses the client/server architecture, each computer or process in the network is either a client or a server. Thus, *Conmy* discloses a network of several computers rather than a **single standalone** PDA. The scheduling of an electronic calendar in a network of multiple computers as in *Conmy*, uses calendar information, such as "user calendar files 210", that are stored in several databases such as database 200 in FIG. 1 of *Conmy*. Thus, *Conmy*'s teaching requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, coupled to a network of personal computers (user systems) sharing calendar information

stored on several databases and servers on a network. Therefore, *Conmy* teaches an electronic calendar used in a network client/server system and not in a standalone PDA or portable data storage module.

Mann discloses an **audio video docking apparatus** for portable electronic devices such as camcorders. *Mann* does not disclose either a PDA or a networked computer system but rather a docking system that is controlled by a microprocessor that executes an algorithm based on a calendar. For example, the microprocessor in *Mann*'s docking system can be used to automatically generate "an on screen display greeting salutation to occur at midnight on New Year's eve" (column 3, lines 33-36). In addition, the calendar based algorithm in the docking system of *Mann* can be used to initiate operation of other devices. For example, a user can use the docking system in *Mann* to start the operation of a VCR on a given day and time. (Column 5, lines 64-67). A calendar based algorithm for use in controlling devices has nothing to do with the presentation of multiple calendars on a personal organizer. Thus, *Mann* does not display any calendars of any sort, let alone multiple calendars or foreign calendars.

THE CITED ART DISTINGUISHED

CLAIMS 1-6

Claim 1 teaches a portable data storage module comprising a portable, hand-held housing, an input device situated on a top face of the housing and adapted for allowing input of data, a display situated on the top face of the housing and adapted for depicting data, memory situated in the interior space of the housing for storing a plurality of calendars each including a plurality of scheduled matters, and a controller situated in the interior space of the housing and connected between the input device, the display, and the memory, the controller suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display.

Jenson and *Conmy*, either alone or in combination, clearly do not teach, hint or suggest the combination of claim 1. *Jenson* fails to teach a portable storage module for simultaneously depicting multiple calendars in a single display on a top face of a PDA or a controller suitable for

simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display. *Jenson's* teaching is directed to a portable personal digital assistant, which in the past has been thought of as personal to the user and his personal needs, and therefore needs only to display a **single** calendar.

Conmy fails to teach, hint or suggest simultaneously depicting multiple calendars in a single display. For example, FIGs. 5 through 9 of *Conmy* display a single consolidated dialog box that contains "a result performed by the chairman (column 8, lines 8-10). Rather than simultaneously displaying multiple calendars, *Conmy* displays only the results in scheduling an event. The results of scheduling an event are based on the calendar information from multiple calendars. However, using calendar information from multiple calendars for displaying on a single dialog box, as in FIGs. 5 through 9, is not the same as simultaneously depicting multiple calendars in a single display.

Further, Claim 1 requires a "memory situated in the interior space of the housing for storing a plurality of calendars". In other words, **the plurality of calendars is stored within** the portable data storage module.

In contrast, *Conmy* discloses an "electronic calendar system" in a "client/server architecture" (column 3, lines 21-24). In the client/server architecture of *Conmy*, the "calendar files 210" are **stored** in an "electronic mail file associated with each user" (column 3, lines 66-67; column 4, lines 1-5). Electronic mail files are, in turn, stored on "servers 204 associated with the particular user (column 4, lines 1-5). Thus, *Conmy* teaches away from storing multiple calendars on a **single standalone** portable data storage module. A single standalone portable data storage module is necessarily **not** part of a network of computers.

Further, in *Conmy*, information from the calendar files are stored in several databases 200. For example, "[D]atabase 200 may then comprise an up-to-date collection of the availability information from those electronic mail files collected from some or all the servers 204 on the system" (column 4, lines 6-10).

FIG. 1 of *Conmy* clearly shows a network of computers in a client/server environment. Users systems 206 are the individual computers that connect various users of the system. In *Conmy*, each user system 206 may comprise a computer system connected over a network to one or more other

users and to one or more servers (column 4, lines 17- 19). User systems 206 may also be connected over an intranet or over the internet to one or more other systems (column 4, lines 19-21). Thus, user systems 206 are connected to several servers 204. The servers 204 are in turn connected to several databases 202. Clearly, FIG. 1 illustrates an electronic calendar for a network where the calendar files are stored in several servers that are connected to the network.

In contrast, Claim 1 teaches a plurality of calendars that are stored in “memory situated in the interior space of the housing”. In other words, Claim 1 teaches a standalone “data storage module” that has a memory that stores multiple calendars, which is clearly distinguished from *Conmy*’s network of several servers and databases that store the various calendar files 210. For example a user of a portable data storage module such as a PDA based on the present invention can display and manipulate the multiple calendars on the user’s PDA without accessing the network since all the calendars that are being displayed are stored on the user’s PDA’s internal memory.

Thus, *Jenson* and *Conmy* , either alone or in combination, clearly do not teach, hint or suggest the steps required by Claim 1 and actually teaches away from storing multiple calendars **within** the “portable data storage module. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art and respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 4 ,5 and 6 either directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 2, 3 ,4 ,5 and 6 introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable over the cited art. For example, Claim 2 recites that “the scheduled matters are depicted on the display with each calendar”. In contrast, FIGs. 5 through 9 of *Conmy* displays a **single** “dialog box”. The dialog box of FIGs. 5 through 9 contain “the information retrieved by the system as a result of the search for a proposed event (column 8, lines 8-10; lines 26-30; lines 31-34; lines 45-47; lines 48-51). Thus, the single dialog box as shown in FIGs. 5 through 9 of *Conmy* teaches away from depicting scheduled matters with **each** calendar in the display of multiple calendars.

CLAIMS 7, 11, 18, and 20

Independent Claims 7, 11, 18, and 20, include the limitation of “storing various calendars within a portable data storage module in separate databases”.

Thus, Claims 7, 11, 18 and 20 are also believed patentable over cited art including *Jenson* in view of *Conmy*. As already explained herein, *Jenson* does not teach or suggest a method for displaying multiple calendars on a portable personal organizer such as a PDA with limited circuitry and a small display on the top face of a display. Further, *Jenson* does not teach the storing of various calendars in separate databases. *Conmy* discloses user calendar files 210 in separate databases 200 at FIG. 1. However, FIG. 1 of *Conmy* clearly illustrates that the databases are not stored **within a single** user system 206. Further *Conmy* teaches away from a standalone user system. Rather, FIG. 1 of *Conmy* clearly shows a network of computers including databases and servers in a client/.server environment. Users systems 206 are the individual computers that connect various users of the system. In *Conmy*, each user system 206 may comprise a computer system connected over a network to one or more other users and to one or more servers (column 4, lines 17- 19). Note that, in *Conmy*, the databases 200 may be accessed by one or more servers 204 over the network” (column 4, lines 14-16). Thus, user systems 206 are connected to several servers 204 and databases 200 are not stored within a user system.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention as claimed in claims 7, 11, 18, 20 are patentably distinguishable from *Jenson* in view of *Conmy* and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7, 11, 18, 20.

CLAIM 22

The invention as claimed in Claim 22 is believed to be patentable over *Jenson* in view of *Conmy*. The claim 22 recites in part “providing a common database including a plurality of identification data sets each corresponding to the calendar of one of the calendar databases” in the portable data storage module. In other words, there is a common database in the portable data storage module for storing a plurality of data sets each corresponding to the calendar of one of the calendar databases (page 12, lines 6-14). The common database allows the scheduled matters to be

shared among the calendar databases (page 12, lines 22-23). No combination of *Jenson* and *Conmy* teaches or suggests these limitations. Furthermore, as discussed above, unlike *Jenson* or *Conmy*, alone or combined, the claimed invention teaches displaying a plurality of calendars. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention as claimed in claim 22 is patentably distinguishable from *Jenson* in view of *Conmy* and respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 22 be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27

Claims 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27 either directly or indirectly depend from Claim 7, 11, 18, 20, or 22 respectively and include all the limitations of the claims from which they depend. Thus, Claims 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 7, 11, 18, 20, and 22.

Furthermore, Claims 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27 introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable over the cited art. For example, Claim 26 recites that one of the attributes indicates that one of the calendars is a foreign calendar. According to the Office Action, “Mann teaches the creation of custom calendar, which may include a foreign calendar.”


Mann discloses an **audio video docking apparatus** for portable electronic devices such as camcorders. Thus, *Mann* has nothing to do with the displaying calendars in the context personal organizers. *Mann* does not disclose either a PDA or a networked computer system but rather a **docking** system that is controlled by a microprocessor that executes an algorithm based on a calendar. For example, the microprocessor in *Mann*’s docking system can be used to automatically generate “an on screen display greeting salutation to occur at midnight on New Year’s eve” (column 3, lines 33-36). In addition, the calendar based algorithm in the docking system of *Mann* can be used to initiate operation of other devices. For example, a user can use the docking system in *Mann* to start the operation of a VCR on a given day and time. (Column 5, lines 64-67). A calendar based algorithm for use in controlling devices has nothing to do with the presentation of multiple calendars on a personal organizer. Thus, *Mann* does not display any calendars of any sort, let alone multiple calendars or foreign calendars.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that pending claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections and objections. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP


Carina M. Tan
Reg. 45,769

Date: October 15, 2001
1400 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
650-320-4000